

DRAF

M-1 (Woodward Avenue) at
M-102 (Eight Mile Road)
Environmental Assessment (EA)
Community Visioning Forum
November 6, 2003

Prepared by:
DLZ, Inc.
The Corradino Group of Michigan, Inc.

December
2003

1. Introduction

The Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT), in response to ongoing community concerns, and through its commitment to keep the public fully involved and informed, is studying the intersection of two major state trunklines, M-1 (Woodward Avenue) and M-102 (Eight Mile Road), to identify recommended improvements. These improvements are desired to maintain existing traffic operations, address local concerns related to aesthetics and accommodate future traffic volumes.

Currently there are three levels to the intersection (Figure 1). Through traffic on Woodward Avenue passes uninterrupted over the intersection. Through traffic on Eight Mile Road passes uninterrupted under the intersection. All turns occur at the middle, at-ground level.

The environmental assessment (EA) will examine the environment and analyze issues at this location. When completed, it will include, but not be limited to the following:

- Intensive public participation during the study process
- Aesthetics analyses
- Current traffic counts and traffic analyses
- Consideration of potential plans for transit within the corridor
- Analysis of direct, indirect, and cumulative effects of the project

The participation of local communities (citizens and their leaders), local organizations and other stakeholders is an integral component of the study. The study is expected to last approximately one year, during which the EA will be prepared. Public participation activities will result in a Public Hearing at which formal comments on the study will be gathered. This is now expected to occur in the spring of 2004.

When a Preferred Alternative is identified by MDOT and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), the project will then move on to the next phase (the design phase).



Figure 1
M-1 (Woodward Avenue)/M-102 (Eight Mile Road) Intersection

2. Community Visioning Forum

A community visioning forum was conducted on November 6, 2003, at the Michigan State Fairgrounds (see Appendix A for list of citizens participating). It followed a meeting held in Ferndale on September 25 to introduce the project to the public. At the September meeting, disposable cameras were distributed to those who attended. They were asked to return the cameras in October with photos of places/items that they were, or would be, proud of or concerned about as they related to the M-1 (Woodward Avenue)/M-102 (Eight Mile Road) area. This material was used at the visioning session. (See Appendix B for the photos displayed at the meeting.)

The November Community Visioning Forum was designed to allow participants to define their vision of the future of the area served by M-1 (Woodward Avenue) and M-102 (Eight Mile Road). As participants entered the meeting room, each was assigned randomly to a group which worked together throughout the visioning session. The meeting began with a presentation of the history of the area and Woodward Avenue's role in it (Figure 2). Then the current conditions of the area were reviewed. Following that discussion, participants, working in the small groups to which they were assigned (usually numbering up to six people), articulated those items that make them proud of the area as well as concern them. These issues were summarized for the entire forum before moving into the visioning session.

During the visioning portion of the meeting, participants were asked to describe what they see in their "mind's eye" for the area in 2025. Each person described what pleases them and what makes them feel good. The composite vision will help MDOT evaluate alternative physical improvements for the M-1 (Woodward Avenue) and M-102 (Eight Mile Road) intersection.

2.1 What the People Are Proud Of

Tables 1 through 9 describe the "prouds" most frequently articulated by the people who attended the November Visioning Forum. This summary is derived from the many issues discussed at the forum and included in Appendix C.

Figure 2
Community Visioning Agenda

M1-M102 Environmental Assessment Community Visioning Forum AGENDA November 6, 2003	
<u>Overview</u>	
Welcome	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MDOT responsive to community input. Break into small groups.
Looking at the past	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participants are taken on a journey into the intersection of Woodward and Eight Mile and as they remember it.
Looking at the present	
Prouds and Concerns	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Each participant identifies what makes them "proud" about Woodward and Eight Mile and what makes them "concerned." Select three proudest "prouds" and three greatest "concerns."
Presentation of intersection proposals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Options to change Woodward and Eight Mile.
Visioning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Imagine a successful and vibrant Woodward and Eight Mile neighborhood in 2025. What would it look like? What would it take to get it there?
Select top "Visions"	
Next Steps	



Overall, the nine groups have a long list of what they are proud about when viewing this area and the M-1 (Woodward Avenue)/M-102 (Eight Mile Road) intersection.

Most significant among these prouds are:

- The safety of the intersection;
- Its engineering design and ability to handle the flow of traffic;
- The character of the area and its neighborhoods; and,
- The understanding that the intersection functions as a gateway to/link of two communities (Table 1).

2.2 Concerns

The participants of the Visioning Forum were also asked to reflect on the items that concern them about the Woodward/Eight Mile Road intersection and the surrounding area. These concerns are presented in their entirety in Appendix B. The most significant among them are summarized on Table 1.

Overall, items that most concern the participants are:

- The condition of the Woodward Avenue bridge, including its aesthetics and the associated need to rehabilitate it;
- The safety of the intersection;
- The issue of development at the intersection; and,
- The cost to remove the bridge structure.

2.3 Visions for the Intersection/Area

As a natural follow-up to the discussion of “prouds” and “concerns,” the visioning session participants were then asked to articulate their visions of the area’s future. A complete listing is included in Appendix B. Each group was asked to prioritize its top five visions and then each of those were prioritized by all participants. The results are shown in Table 2. From that information, the following are observed as the top five visions:

- A walkable, landscaped, lighted, aesthetically pleasing area at and around the intersection;
- Viable neighborhoods that are thriving and safe;
- High-type/world class mass transit;
- Use of the State Fairgrounds in a manner that is good for the surrounding neighborhoods;
- An area that serves as a viable business/cultural center.

2.4 Preliminary Vision Statement

With this information, a “preliminary” vision can be stated as follows:



In 2025, the community around the M-1 (Woodward Avenue)/M-102 (Eight Mile Road) intersection is one where neighborhoods are strong and vibrant. The area in which they exist is seen by all as a viable business/cultural center that is walkable, landscaped and aesthetically pleasing. It is served by high-type/world class transit. And, developments at the State Fairgrounds, and in the four quadrants of the M-1 (Woodward Avenue)/M-102 (Eight Mile Road) intersection, sustain the quality of life of the surrounding neighborhoods.



Table 1
M-1 (Woodward Avenue)/M-102 (Eight Mile Road)
Environmental Assessment (EA) Study
Most Significant Prouds/Concerns

Group	Prouds	Concerns
A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Historical value ■ Safe and efficient design ■ Gorgeous bridge-top views/vistas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Poor judgments based on fear ■ Class division and racism ■ Need to fix and rehab bridge <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Poor aesthetics ✓ Poor condition
B	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Safer intersection with current bridge ■ Bridge is pedestrian-friendly ■ (Current intersection) keeps traffic out of neighborhoods 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Overall lighting at bridge ■ Cost of removing bridge ■ Overall condition of bridge
C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Good traffic flow ■ Area/intersection is gateway to Detroit ■ Bridge does not promote crime 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Absence of light rail travel ■ Bridge's decay ■ Bridge's shadow makes businesses hard to find
D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Nicely engineered bridge ■ Bridge provides safety (vehicles and pedestrians) ■ Heritage site 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Safety at intersection ■ Accessibility as affected by destruction of bridge ■ Cost of rebuilding bridge/harm to surrounding area by destruction of bridge
E	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Strong neighborhoods ■ Good safety record (of intersection) ■ Navigational landmark <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Design impedes crime/transients 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Future development can happen with bridge <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Proposed redevelopment of 38 acres ■ Maintenance <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Who? ✓ Why not being done? ■ Safety of: pedestrians, traffic, lighting, no razing
F	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Tree-lined avenue ■ Neighborhoods ■ Process being used ■ Convenience of bridge 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Preservation of existing properties ■ Safety ■ Long-term maintenance <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Overall aesthetics
G	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Character of surrounding areas and development ■ Substantial avenues (widths and capacities) ■ Ferndale area as cultural center 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ State of future development of State Fairgrounds ■ Bridge reduces potential for development at intersection ■ Aesthetics of bridge
H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Safety (autos) ■ Efficient traffic flow ■ Convenience of bus stops 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Railings don't look nice (aesthetics) ■ Physical condition/maintenance ■ Adjacent properties not developed <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Lost potential
I	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Bridge as a gateway ■ No gas stations, fast food, liquor stores ■ Neighborhood character 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Cheap, crappy architecture of bridge ■ Bad condition of bridge (poor maintenance) ■ Poor condition of road ■ Bad architecture of buildings

Table 2
M-1 (Woodward Avenue)/M-102 (Eight Mile Road)
Environmental Assessment (EA) Study
Vision Priorities

Vision	Selection	Percent
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Walkable, landscaped, lighted, aesthetically pleasing area at and around intersection <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Architecturally significant ✓ Public art with historic theme ✓ Murals ✓ Brick/wrought iron ✓ Hanging baskets ✓ Gateway monument/lookout 	39	30
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Viable neighborhoods <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Safe ✓ Thriving 	19	14
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ High-type/world class mass transit 	19	14
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Use of State Fairgrounds in a manner that is good for surrounding neighborhoods <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Year round as family place ✓ As “Central Park”/fenceless ✓ To enrich people 	12	9
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Viable business center/cultural center 	11	8
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Rehabbed bridge; make aesthetically pleasing 	8	6
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Bridge is gone, community/district identified with public art, destination and mixed land use at the four quadrants 	8	6
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ State Fairgrounds becomes a vital attraction 	4	3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Seamless flow of traffic 	4	3
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Greenbelt/parks on all four corners plus extended medians – greenbelting on Woodward/Eight Mile 	3	2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ More interaction between north, south, east, west neighborhoods and communities 	3	2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Greater safety for motorists who do not have to stop for red light 	2	2
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ No bridge, widened boulevard with separate “local access only” streets, separated by tree-lined greenbelt 	1	1

3. Next Steps

The information contained in this report will now become the focus of defining and evaluating alternative treatments of the M-1 (Woodward Avenue)/M-102 (Eight Mile Road) intersection. Preliminary information developed through that work will be presented to the public in January 2004 so further community input can be gathered.

I:\projects\3345 8 mile\wp\reports\visioningfourm\text.doc

Appendix

Community Vision Forum

Participants¹
M-1 (Woodward Avenue)/M-102 (Eight Mile Road)
Environmental Assessment (EA)
Community Visioning Forum
November 6, 2003

Lettie Barge
Tom Barwin
Scott Bradford
Michael Brennan
Heather Carmona
Nancy Diane Carter
Pat Cissell
Kelley Cook
Brian Cooley
Michael Dallem
Curtis Dickerson
Robert Gold
Julia Halpin
Sandra Ham
Kathryn Hammon
Marie Handley
Robert Handley
Calvin Highland
Beth Holland
Tim Jenkins
Russ Kramer

Jane Kyrianopoulos
John Kyrianopoulos
Felicity A. Leddy
Lois McLain
Janet Narich
Christie Peach
Robert B. Prud'homme
A. Purtell
Elizabeth Schneider
Donald Ray Smith
Anthony W. Spencer
Steve Squires
Jean Sterritt
John Sterritt
Stacey Tobar
Karla L. Voight
Theresa Welch
Ray Wolf
Darrell Youngquest
Tom Zerafa

¹Several participants' handwriting could not be deciphered and their names, therefore, are not included here. Names have been listed alphabetically for convenience.

Appendix

Photos Displayed at

Appendix B can be found on the Web site (www.michigan.gov/mdotstudies) at M-1/M-102 Environmental Assessment under “Public Involvement/Citizens’ Photos.”

Appendix

Community Visioning
Forum
Prouds/Concerns/Visions

Table C-1
M-1/M-102 Community Visioning Forum
Statements of Prouds/Concerns and Visions
Group A

Prouds	Concerns
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ People passionate about neighborhood ■ Long views/vistas ■ Neighborhood ■ History ■ Protection from rain ■ Love bridge ■ Safe and effective for traffic ■ Hallmark boundary ■ Prohibits crime 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Judgments based on fear ■ Drugs/homeless people/prostitution ■ Poor aesthetics/need to fix bridge ■ Bridge ugly ■ Class division/racism ■ Bridge hindrance to transit

Visions
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Landscaping: plantings/ivy, etc. ■ Architectural treatments ■ Lighting improvements under and around bridge ■ Pedestrian treatments/streetscape ■ “Smiley Faces” ■ Improved railings/grill work ■ Signs: “Welcome to Detroit/Ferndale” ■ Pavement and curb improvements ■ Murals on bridge ■ Improved development ■ Mass transit (allow for) ■ No bridge/wide boulevard – local access lanes separated from the avenue with tree-lined lanes ■ Light rail and station at bridge with pedestrian access ■ Woodward/Eight Mile would be transit station with roundabout

Table C-2
M-1/M-102 Community Visioning Forum
Statements of Prouds/Concerns and Visions
Group B

Prouds	Concerns
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Less expensive to renovate (bridge) ■ Design of bridge/intersection (function) ■ Safer intersection with current bridge ■ Potential development ■ Bridge is pedestrian-friendly ■ View of downtown from top of bridge ■ Keeps flow of traffic out of neighborhoods 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Cost of removing bridge ■ Impact of Fairgrounds ■ Overall lighting at bridge ■ Overall condition of bridge ■ Obstructive (bridge) structure

Visions
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Landscaping/trees/shade ■ Good homes and businesses, children playing, bridge still there ■ Attractive, minimally-impacting bridge ■ Billboards (2) are gone (on corners) ■ More interaction between north/south/east/west of bridge ■ Use of Fairgrounds that is good for neighborhoods ■ “Stanley Has BLT” a new restaurant ■ Preventative maintenance program for bridge ■ More community involvement ■ Well-policed, both sides (safe, non-crime) ■ Well-lit bridge ■ Matching three-story condos (northwest and southeast corners) ■ Bridge is historically designated one of many automotive history landmarks ■ Better design of northbound/southbound (median) dividers ■ Clean

Table C-3
M-1/M-102 Community Visioning Forum
Statements of Prouds/Concerns and Visions
Group C

Prouds	Concerns
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Style of bridge ■ Good traffic flow ■ Area/intersection is gateway to Detroit ■ History of intersection and area ■ Rebound of Ferndale (including downtown) plus revitalization of Detroit ■ Intersection links/connects two communities ■ Bridge sign: “Stop Stupid Wars!” ■ Bridge does not promote crime. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Bridge equals blight on area ■ Bridge’s decay ■ Absence of light rail transit ■ Bridge’s shadow makes businesses hard to find ■ Bridge lends to perception that area is crime-prone/threatened

Visions
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Walkable community with green spaces ■ Lushly landscaped community ■ High-type/world class transit ■ The community is a magnet ■ Viable businesses from Seven Mile Road, north, that attract from north and south ■ Superb schools that develop people who enrich community ■ Traffic flow tomorrow equal to today ■ Slowed/calmed traffic on Woodward ■ State Fairgrounds becomes vital attraction ■ Developed northeast quadrant of Fairgrounds to enrich people ■ Architecturally significant gateway

Table C-4
M-1/M-102 Community Visioning Forum
Statements of Prouds/Concerns and Visions
Group D

Prouds	Concerns
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Nicely engineered (bridge) and provides safety ■ Fresh air and trees ■ Heritage site 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Frequency of serious accidents at intersection ■ Pedestrian lighting, access, safety at intersection and at intermodal (terminal) ■ Cost to rebuild/environment ■ Access to neighborhoods if bridge comes down ■ Intermodal at Fairgrounds ■ Safe neighborhood access ■ Not enough green area

Visions
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Continuation of Greenbelt and parks on all four corners ■ Median strips on Eight Mile/Woodward extended ■ Viable neighborhoods, including bridge ■ Reduction in vehicular traffic/public transit ■ More trees and lights (state-of-the-art) ■ Public art of historic Woodward through a theme associated with the bridge ■ Improved pedestrian ambience (including greenbelt, art, lighting and park designations)

Table C-5
M-1/M-102 Community Visioning Forum
Statements of Prouds/Concerns and Visions
Group E

Prouds	Concerns
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Safety record ■ Navigational landmark ■ Design impedes crime and transients ■ Strong neighborhoods ■ Saves fuel and reduces pollution (intersection) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Maintenance: responsibility/disregard ■ Lack of beautification ■ Safety in design: pedestrians, traffic, no razing, lighting ■ Future development of 38 acres ■ Future development can happen with bridge ■ (Potential) loss of homes or businesses ■ Increased traffic on side streets

Visions
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Beautiful ■ Park-like green space ■ Welcoming ■ Unified theme ■ No traffic jams ■ No traffic donuts ■ Unique bridge landmark ■ Historic ■ Quiet ■ Stable neighborhoods ■ Brick and wrought iron ■ Murals ■ Artwork ■ Ornamental lighting to create landmark ■ Beautifully maintained ■ Welcoming signs ■ Premiere gateway ■ Contagious quality ■ Timed intersection (signals) for flow of traffic ■ Community involvement on decision that affect residents ■ Children contribute to artwork on bridge ■ Community art projects ■ Hanging baskets on bridges

Table C-6
M-1/M-102 Community Visioning Forum
Statements of Prouds/Concerns and Visions
Group F

Prouds	Concerns
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Being part of community that puts pedestrian needs first ■ Movement of traffic ■ Tree-lined avenue ■ Neighborhoods ■ Process we are using to solve this problem ■ Bridge overpass is excellent traffic engineering ■ Convenience bridge offers to north/south traffic 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Safety ■ Long-term maintenance ■ Overall aesthetic ■ Business access ■ Wasted landscape of current condition ■ Commercialization of some residential (area) ■ Loss of residential property or commercial property ■ No potential for mass transit in current configuration ■ Michigan State Fair and needs for interchange ■ Lack of pedestrian access in current configuration ■ Bus stop in very poor location ■ Traffic counts do not support bridge ■ If bridge structure is removed over Eight Mile Road, might not support

Visions
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ People on the street ■ Rehabilitated bridge, aesthetically pleasing ■ Neighborhoods thriving/healthy ■ Thriving retail business on all four corners ■ Grade-level access ■ Maintain diversity/end “White Flight” ■ Safety maintained ■ Transit hub at Eight Mile/Woodward ■ Improved landscape/aesthetics ■ No mile-long backups ■ Art modern storefronts at northeast quadrant – improved/accessible ■ Smooth flow/access for traffic <u>and</u> pedestrians ■ Neighborhood-friendly development ■ Attractive housing development at State Fairgrounds ■ Transit-oriented development ■ No Big Box stores/liquor stores/fast food/party stores/gas stations ■ State Fairgrounds accessible/open year round, “Central Park”/no fences

Table C-7
M-1/M-102 Community Visioning Forum
Statements of Prouds/Concerns and Visions
Group G

Prouds	Concerns
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Substantial avenues (widths/capacities) ■ Ferndale as cultural center ■ Character of neighborhood, trees, etc. ■ State Fairgrounds: size and potential ■ Michigan “Left” (turn) ■ Character of area 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Deterioration of bridge ■ Visual/aesthetics of bridge ■ Noise level impacts on residents ■ Lack of optimal use of intersection and surroundings ■ Eight Mile Road is division line ■ Development of State Fairgrounds – future traffic, etc. ■ Bridge reduces economic development of four corners ■ Personal safety

Visions
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Shopping ■ Cleaned-up Woodward ■ Improved neighborhoods ■ Major mass transit hub ■ Foot traffic ■ Clean “cruise” terminus ■ Cultural and business center ■ Youth center ■ Green spaces and parks ■ International destination ■ Economic development brings traffic, wider roads because of increase in traffic ■ Technically advanced, efficient transit ■ Gateway – defines area ■ “Eiffel Tower”-type monument and lookout ■ Increased population and property values

Table C-8
M-1/M-102 Community Visioning Forum
Statements of Prouds/Concerns and Visions
Group H

Prouds	Concerns
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Landmark ■ Safety (autos) ■ Efficient traffic flow ■ Connects two sides/brings together (bridge) ■ Convenience of bus stops 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Landmark ■ Aesthetics (railings don't look nice) ■ Physical condition/maintenance ■ Safety, related to condition (concrete) ■ Lack of lighting ■ No bus shelters ■ Graffiti/vandalism ■ No landmark plaque ■ Adjacent properties not developed – lost potential ■ Vagrancy – move them away

Visions
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Bridge stays with aesthetics improvements: bridge, landscaping ■ Vacant parcels on south are parks ■ Right-turn lane on State Fair side (of Eight Mile) ■ Woodstock/Woodward intersection at 90° ■ Brick pavers on service drive/median ■ Rows of trees (continuity) ■ Trees – softscape/flowers ■ No visual clutter/billboards ■ Motels are gone ■ Fairgrounds are park ■ Mixed-use development ■ Bridge is gone, view is better ■ Focal point/public art ■ Transit along Woodward with stop ■ Pedestrian bridge/bike bridge over Woodward at park ■ State has fair, cheap process for decisions ■ Bridge stays and is refurbished ■ Wider bike/pedestrian paths on bridge ■ Reflectors on lane lines ■ Trees – like Belle Isle/other landscaping ■ More parks at Fairgrounds ■ No transit (rail) ■ Boulevard expanded ■ More landscaping ■ More identity districts, community identity signs ■ Public art ■ More of a destination ■ Mixed-use – more commercial, retail

Table C-9
M-1/M-102 Community Visioning Forum
Statements of Prouds/Concerns and Visions
Group I

Prouds	Concerns
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Slows down traffic ■ Separates traffic ■ Acts as a gateway ■ Good vistas ■ Minimal development ■ No gas stations, fast food, liquor stores ■ More wholesome neighborhoods ■ Neighborhood character 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Cheap (crappy) architecture (bridge): unwalkable, unsafe, unlit, divides neighborhoods ■ Bad condition (bridge maintenance) ■ Poor signage (directional, identification) ■ Poor road condition ■ No bus shelter ■ Transit ■ Fast speeds (on bridge) ■ Bad architecture of buildings

Visions
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ State Fairgrounds used year-round ■ Mixed-use: housing/commercial, State Fairgrounds ■ Safe gateway ■ Architecturally stimulating (area) ■ Aesthetically pleasing ■ Safe, thriving neighborhoods ■ Community interaction (east/west and north/south) – transparent boundaries ■ GREEN (landscaping/streetscape) ■ Historically significant ■ Community supported ■ Thriving development (all kinds) ■ Showcase intersection/area (world class) ■ Gateway to both cities – north and south ■ Alternative mode, transit-friendly ■ State Fairgrounds as Metro Park ■ Bridge still there (like now)